

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

SUGAR REPORTS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE
SUGAR DIVISION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 1961

NO. 106

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
1. MARKET REVIEW	2 - 5
2. SPECIAL STUDY GROUP ON SUGAR -- SUMMARY REPORT	6 - 12
3. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	13
4. STATISTICAL SERIES	14 - 27
(a) Highlights	14
(b) Supply and Disposition Summary: January-December 1960	15
(c) Disposition and stocks: January-December 1960 and 1959 January 1961	16 16
(d) Mainland Production and Quota Charges: January-December 1960 and 1959	17
(e) Refiners' and Importers' receipts by Source of supply: January-December 1960 and 1959	17
(f) Status of Quota and Non-quota Purchase sugar to February 10, 1961 to end January 1961	18 - 19 20 - 21
(g) Deliveries by States: December and fourth quarter 1960 Calendar year 1960 and 1959	22 - 23 24 - 25
(h) Sugar Prices by Areas	26
(i) Refined sugar production and stocks	27

MARKET REVIEW

A generally quiet market situation and the impending expiration of the Sugar Act on March 31, 1961 focused attention during February upon legislative developments. Commanding most interest as the month ended were:

1. The recommendation by the Administration of extension of the present Sugar Act through 1962 with the further provision that the President be relieved of the obligation to purchase from the Dominican Republic any portion of the quantity of sugar not taken from Cuba.

2. The Report of a Special Sugar Study Group on long range sugar problems to the House Committee on Agriculture. The highlights of the report were presented in a talk by Nathan Koffsky, Chairman of the Study Group, which is reproduced later in this report.

The domestic sugar market during the early 1961 was characterized by physical movement of sugar by all primary distributors about equal to a year ago, larger sugar stocks held by all segments of the industry, refined sugar price quotations about 0.2 cent per pound higher than in early 1960 and raw sugar prices starting about 0.5 cent higher than a year ago but declining a little during the period.

Deliveries for mainland consumption reported by primary distributors for January 1 through February 11, 1961 totaled about 850,000 short tons, raw value, or 76,000 tons more than for the same period last year. Beet sugar deliveries reported in this period increased by 81,000 tons, roughly offsetting deliveries in the comparable period of 1960 which were made to fulfill constructive deliveries reported in December 1959. Thus over-all physical deliveries in the two periods are quite comparable.

Refiners' raw sugar stocks at the end of 1960 were 34,000 tons higher than at the beginning while their refined sugar stocks were 18,000 tons lower, so that total refiners' stocks increased 16,000 tons during the year.

Receipts by refiners this year through February 11 were about 55,000 tons more than during the same period last year and with deliveries up

only 12,000 tons, refiners' total stocks in mid February were 59,000 tons higher than a year ago. Their raw sugar stocks were about 87,000 tons larger while refined stocks were about 28,000 tons smaller.

Beet processors' stocks on February 11, 1961 were about 200,000 tons greater than a year ago. At the beginning of the year their stocks had been 275,000 tons above those on January 1, 1960.

Deliveries of sugar by states in 1960 as compared to 1959 reflect the reduced beet sugar constructive deliveries at the end of 1960, 3,000 tons, as compared to the 125,000 tons included in 1959 deliveries and about 85,000 tons included in 1958 deliveries. Beet sugar deliveries to Illinois during 1960 dropped 29,000 tons from those of 1959 and deliveries to California were down 36,000 tons. Constructive deliveries to both of these states during 1959 exceeded these decreases. For all North Central states, beet sugar deliveries declined 31,000 tons but constructive deliveries of about 70,000 tons were included in the 1959 deliveries. Beet sugar deliveries to the Western states during 1960 were down 52,000 tons from those of 1959 an amount about equal to the 1959 constructive deliveries to those states.

Refiners' 1960 deliveries increased to all regions except the Western. About half of the 204,000 ton increase was to the Southern states. Of the 45,000 ton increase to the North Central states about 25,000 tons were accounted for by Ohio. Refiners' deliveries to the Mid-Atlantic states increased about 60,000 tons; about 48,000 tons of which represented increased deliveries to Pennsylvania where importers' deliveries were down 35,000 tons.

Sugar for U.S. consumption available to importers of refined sugar during 1960 totaled 595,000 tons or 17,000 tons less than during the previous year. However, importers' deliveries during 1960 were down 45,000 tons from those of the previous year with a consequent increase in their year end stocks of 24,000 tons. As previously noted, importers' deliveries were down 35,000 in Pennsylvania. Other significant decreases occurred in Florida, Michigan, California and Maryland but importers increased deliveries to Virginia, North Carolina, New York, Wisconsin, Washington and Oregon.

Refined sugar prices at the end of February were unchanged from those prevailing a month earlier except for a decline of 0.15 cent. in the Southeast effective February 17. Beet processors continued to take

business for delivery through March 31 at 0.20 cent below the quoted price in the Chicago-West territory.

WHOLESALE REFINED SUGAR PRICE QUOTATIONS
AS OF FEBRUARY 24, 1961

	<u>Cane</u> cents	<u>Beet</u> per pound
Northeast	9.55	9.00 Western N.Y. & Pa.
Eastern beet		8.35 Michigan
Southeast	9.30	
Gulf	9.50	
Chicago-West)	8.80	8.80
South-West)		
<u>Pacific Coast</u>		
California, Arizona, Nevada	8.95	8.95
Oregon-Washington	8.80	8.80
Balance Territory	8.90	8.80

The spot price of domestic raw sugar No. 7 contract at New York averaged 6.36 cents per pound from January 1 through February 23, 1961, 0.42 cent higher than for the same period last year. At the beginning of the year the raw sugar spot price was 6.41 cents but by the end of January it had dropped to 6.31 cents where it remained until February 15. A price of 6.33 cents has prevailed since that date through February 23.

The spot price for No. 8 contract world raw sugar, which was 2.95 cents per pound at the beginning of the year, reached a high of 3.06 cents for the period January 9-23. On February 14 and 15 the low for the year of 2.90 cents was reached followed by a rising tendency and for February 20-23 the spot was at 2.95 cents per pound. The average since January 1 has been 3.00 cents, the same as for the contract No. 4 quotations for the same period a year ago.

The International Sugar Council, meeting in London, adopted final initial export quotas amounting to 82.5 percent of basic export tonnages, 90 percent in the case of countries having basic export tonnages of

50,000 metric tons or less. This represents a 2.5 point reduction from preliminary initial export quotas which had been set at 85 percent last November.

Exporting countries were relieved of the requirement to report their 1961 shortfalls so that shortfalls need not be redistributed. With these actions, available supplies including about 750,000 tons from non-member exporting countries were brought into balance with estimated requirements of the free market of 8.6 million tons. This total includes Soviet requirements of 2.7 million tons and Mainland China requirements of 0.5 million tons of Cuban sugar. The U.S.S.R. delegate announced that his country's sugar imports will be for domestic consumption and that Soviet exports will not exceed the customary level.

For purposes of the Agreement, the Council also agreed to consider the average between the New York Contract No. 8 spot price and the London daily price, both rolled back to an f.a.s. Cuban port basis, as its new price standard in lieu of the discontinued New York contract No. 4 spot price quotation.

Colombia, Ecuador and New Zealand were welcomed as new member countries. Mr. Mori (Japan) was elected Chairman of the Council for 1961 to take the place of Mr. Matsumura (Japan) who had been elected last fall but was subsequently assigned to other duties by his government.

Talk by Nathan M. Koffsky
Chairman, Special Study Group on Sugar
United States Department of Agriculture
before
The Sugar Club
New York City
February 16, 1961

First let me say a few words about what the report of the Special Study Group does and does not. The report basically is a source document for evaluating the various alternatives open to the United States in developing a sugar policy. The group was not asked to recommend what policy should be but rather the factors that should be considered and the end results of alternative actions. Nor as it turned out, does a clear cut route or solution emerge from our considerations of what is a very complex problem. The report is a sort of do-it-yourself kit for policy makers. Also I would make clear that the report is directed toward the longer-run and not toward the problems of the immediate future. For example, you will find nothing in the report as to how long the present sugar legislation which expires at the end of next month should be extended. Finally, I would call to your attention that the report is the responsibility solely of the Study Group. The views do not necessarily reflect those of the previous Administration, by which the group was appointed, or those of the present Administration.

Turning now to the report itself, I will summarize the major trends or considerations as they appear in the report.

1. Looking ahead over the next decade, the U.S. needs not fear that the break in the traditional flow of Cuban sugar to the U.S. (even if it should persist) will bring a shortage of sugar available to it.

As you know Cuba previously supplied over 3 million tons of sugar to the U.S. -- about one-third of our total requirements. Even if this is no longer available to us -- whether through absorption in the Communist Bloc or through erosion of the Cuban Sugar industry -- there is an abundance of other foreign supplies available now and in prospect for

the future. In the report there is a set of projections prepared by our Foreign Agricultural Service as to the quantity of sugar that could be available to the U.S. from foreign sources other than Cuba after allowing for the requirements of their own increasing consumption and the needs of their traditional customers. If the U.S. maintains its present prices for sugar imports, the foreign supplies available to it, according to these projections, would total close to 9 million tons in 1970, almost double our total imports in 1959. Most of this supply would be in those countries which presently hold U.S. quotas and in other Central and South American countries. Further, even if we should reduce our import prices by 25 percent or roughly 1 1/2 cents per pound of raw sugar -- but still above prices generally prevailing abroad -- total foreign supplies available to us in 1970 would be over 6 million tons.

While this relates to a decade ahead, the immediate foreign supply situation and that of the next several years is also reassuring. World sugar stocks are high with production during this crop year expected to be at a record level. Only a combination of unusual events occurring in rapid succession would be likely to raise world sugar prices to the domestic level for any extended period. Of course, such a situation did occur in late 1956 and 1957, when a short European sugar beet crop was accompanied by the Suez and Hungarian crises, which was followed and aggravated by a short Caribbean sugarcane crop.

Turning to the domestic industry, we also find a substantial capacity to expand at present prices for sugar crops and present price relationships with competing crops. There has been a rapid advance in technology for sugar crops in the post-war period, even more rapid than in most of the agricultural economy. Thus, domestic sugar growers -- according to projections developed by the Agricultural Research Service in cooperation with other technicians -- have the capacity to produce over 8 million tons by 1970 compared with 5 million tons in 1959 and the estimated 5.7 million tons this year for which restrictions have been lifted. Most of the potential increase would occur in sugar beets. However, if prices (including the direct payment incentive) were reduced by 25 percent, domestic production would drop to perhaps 3 million tons by 1970.

We should note that the potential for increasing supplies over the next decade -- both on the domestic side and on the foreign side -- of roughly 3 to 4 million tons each from 1960 far exceeds the probable growth

in U.S. sugar consumption. Total demand grows much the same as population; per capita consumption of sugar has been quite stable for some years. Thus, total consumption might rise about 2 million tons by 1970.

Further, just to illustrate the flexibility which the U.S. has in obtaining supplies of sugar, at prices 25 percent above the present level, the U.S. could obtain all of its supplies either from domestic sources or from foreign suppliers outside of Cuba.

2. It seems clear that from a supply viewpoint the U.S. economy could reasonably expect to fulfill its sugar requirements at significantly lower prices in the decade ahead than the prices that have prevailed in the recent past. But considerations of lower prices, especially if they involve a substantial reduction, would need to be weighed alongside other considerations, such as the goals of sugar legislation since 1934.

These goals have been interpreted to mean a safe and adequate supply of sugar for consumers at prices which would both maintain the domestic sugar industry and be fair and reasonable to consumers. An additional purpose has been to promote the export trade of the U.S.

The set of aims or goals at the base of our present sugar legislation recognizes the interests of the various groups involved -- the several interests of the domestic sugar industry -- including growers, processors, refiners and importers; the foreign sugar suppliers and the export industries in this country which depend on their trade; and the American consumer. For the most part, these interests pull in diverse directions. So we have developed a thoroughly managed sugar economy to try to reconcile these diverse interests. This has involved quota controls and incentives to both domestic producers and foreign suppliers and a stable supply of sugar which has been effectively isolated from the occasional supply and price instabilities of the world markets.

3. In considering a substantial move toward increasing domestic production as against greater reliance on foreign suppliers, the increase in employment and economic activity generated by a sharp rise in domestic production would be balanced more or less by reductions in our export industries. From this overall view, there appears to be some justification for avoiding a rapid and substantial move in one direction as compared with the other.

There is a considerable pressure for expanding domestic production of sugar. This stems largely from the fact that there are unused resources in agriculture and a desire to improve farm income generally. But such a move should be considered alongside the impact on our foreign trade. By and large, the purchases from the U.S. by foreign suppliers have been limited by their dollar earnings which have been augmented in some instances by direct economic aid. In general, these are under-developed economies and dollar-short countries rather than dollar surplus. According to the Boggs Committee on Foreign Trade Policy the jobs of some 4-5 million persons in the U.S. depend on foreign trade. Further, we should also keep in mind that one-sixth of our farm acreage is used for producing export products.

4. Also in looking to the future, we must recognize that we start from a highly controlled system which has molded the sugar economy and its practices for over a quarter century. An abrupt move to a policy of complete free trade would be disruptive.

Since 1934, we have built up a vigorous domestic sugar industry. This has involved price protection and other incentives not only for sugar crop growers but for other elements of the industry. Under conditions of free trade, where the forces of the market place govern, much of our domestic sugar industry would not survive.

While the virtues of free trade and a competitive world are real, in the case of sugar and many other commodities we have lived in a different environment for a long time. Nor is our sugar system unique. Much of the world's sugar moves under special arrangements, some quite similar to ours.

5. The U.S. must decide whether it should reserve a place for the return of Cuba to participation in our sugar market. This has a direct bearing on the kinds of sugar programs that might be pursued.

Until Cuba entered the Communist orbit, its economy for more than 50 years was based substantially on producing sugar primarily for the U.S. market. At such time as normal relations may be reestablished, Cuba's greatest and most immediate need may be for a substantial market for sugar. Further, the advantages to the United States of a large, dependable source of supply nearby is illustrated particularly by our experience during World War II when the task of producing sugar for the United States and many of its allies fell largely on Cuba.

Thus, in considering the alternative approaches open to the United States in developing a sugar policy, particularly those involving the quota system, the future role of Cuba is an important factor. Quota systems build vested interests and once allocated are difficult to rescind. Also, it should be kept in mind that the benefits of the quota premium to foreign suppliers were very largely received by Cuba and were substantially for the purpose of assisting her economy.

6. The alternatives open to the U.S. involve three basic approaches -- quotas, tariffs, or direct payments to producers -- and combinations involving more than one approach. There are some advantages in spreading adjustments through the combined approach. Thus, our present sugar program, in aiming toward the basic goals of the Sugar Act, relies primarily on quotas but incorporates as well a tariff, an excise tax, and payments to producers.

A quota system represents the highest degree of control among the alternative approaches. This route has the capability of ensuring a steady flow of supplies and a high degree of price stability. But the price level is comparatively high on the domestic and foreign sugar which is allowed to be marketed in the U.S. And both domestic producers and foreign suppliers would like to sell much more sugar at the prices which prevail in the U.S. market. This imposes on the U. S. Government a difficult responsibility for allocating shares in supplying U.S. sugar requirements. With the large potential for future production here and for foreign supplies from abroad, problems of allocation are likely to become increasingly difficult within the present price and quota framework. There are some ways, such as the "global import quota" which is described in the report, which would avoid problems of allocating among individual foreign supplying countries and which could be used to reserve a place for Cuban sugar.

To rely on a tariff system alone would represent a substantial loosening of controls as compared with the quota system. There would be no restrictions on where the domestic sugar is produced or where the foreign supply originates. Imports of raw sugar would be at the "world free market" price and the U.S. price would move with it but at a higher level, depending on the size of the tariff.

To provide the degree of price protection which the domestic producer has realized in recent years from the present program would require a tariff rate of \$3.50 per hundred pounds as compared with the present

full duty rate of 62 1/2 cents. We should note that without controls, domestic production by 1970 might account for perhaps 70 percent of our total sugar requirements rather than the present 55 percent, unless price protection is reduced so as to dampen the potential increase in output. Here, we have estimated that a tariff of roughly \$2.75 - \$3.00 would hold the increase in production to approximately 55 percent of the U.S. market. Even so, we should note that such a tariff would be higher than the old Smoot-Hawley tariff. We should also note that our treaty with the Philippines gives that nation substantial tariff concessions on sugar until 1974.

The direct payment approach, which also involves a loosening of controls, basically provides for a lower level of raw sugar prices approximating the "world free market" but at the same time makes a direct payment to the domestic producer to bring returns per unit up to a specified level. Prices to consumers would be lower than under the other approaches but quite variable.

Again if returns per unit to domestic growers were to be maintained, a direct payment of 3 1/2 cents on each pound produced in the U.S. would be required. This compares with the present payment averaging 0.7 cents per pound. The current level of returns, if maintained, would bring a substantial expansion in production such as under comparable tariff protection. If the present legislative distribution as between domestic and foreign supplies is desired, the payment would need to be reduced.

We should also note that if the payment is financed by an excise tax on all sugar -- whether domestic or foreign -- the rate would rise over time. Thus, under present incentives, a rate of \$2.00 per hundred pounds would finance direct payments for the present domestic share but a rate of \$2.50 might be required for the lower production by 1970 and the advantage of lower prices to users would narrow accordingly.

To summarize these three approaches -- without the quota approach, foreign sources of supply might be somewhat less secure than in the past although the present prospect of continued abundant world supplies is reassuring in this respect. Prices would likely be more variable than in the past and would tend to reflect tensions in world markets. To rely on a tariff alone or a direct payment alone to maintain the domestic sugar industry would require much higher tariff rates or much higher payments than those presently in effect. There are, of course,

literally hundreds of alternative combinations involving two or more of the approaches with varying degrees of emphasis on each. They can be devised with quota controls or without quota controls depending on our national objectives. Our present system relies on a combination of all three approaches.

7. Finally, we realize that the Congress will need to consider alternatives for a sugar policy in relation to other national objectives, such as our foreign policies and our policies for agriculture.

We cannot consider sugar policy in a vacuum. For many years, the U. S. has directed its efforts towards reducing trade barriers and encouraging an expansion in world trade under GATT. We have made known our concern over the barriers to our trade, particularly to our exports of agricultural commodities, contemplated by the European Common Market. We recognize also that there may be other elements involved in our national foreign policy, political as well as economic, which could influence the development of a sugar policy in the full national interest.

Further, there are now substantial pressures to expand domestic sugar production sharply and widen opportunities for our farmers. Some of this pressure reflects the fact that since 1953 per unit returns for sugar crops have been maintained while average crop prices have moved to a level some 15 percent lower. Developments in agriculture in the period ahead will have an important bearing on the competitive position of sugar crops relative to other farm opportunities.

X X X X X X X X

The task of forging a sugar policy in this changing world is difficult. It is complicated by the vested interests introduced in the past, by decisions that must be made with respect to Cuba's future role in our sugar market, by the restiveness of our domestic producers under quota controls particularly the strong desire of new areas to enter the market, by the wide hopes of foreign suppliers to participate in what they consider to be an attractive market, and by the many facets of our foreign policy. It is further complicated by the fact that more than half of our sugar is consumed in the form of processed food products wherein the value of the sugar is a small percentage of the total value of the product, mostly within 5 to 10 percent. Here, there may be some question as to how much of any reduction in the price of sugar that might be accomplished would pass on to the ultimate consumer.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONSDate announcedNature of action

February 23,
1961

Permits Philippine raw sugar in excess of the quota for the first quarter of 1961 to be imported during March 1961 for refining and storage until April 1, 1961.

Approximately 50,000 tons of sugar in excess of the Philippine quota for the first quarter of 1961 is scheduled to arrive in late March or early April. Today's action will permit immediate release of any such sugar that arrives in March.

All such sugar must be imported under a USDA bond assuring that it will be stored as refined or raw sugar at the refinery at which it is received. (Scheduled for publication in the February 28, 1961 Federal Register).

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. January 1961 sugar deliveries for continental U.S. consumption, 620,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary), down about 97,000 tons from December 1960 but up 75,000 from January 1960. Final data for December 1960 deliveries, 717,000 tons -- previously published preliminary as 714,000 tons.

2. Primary distributors' stocks February 4, 1961 were 2,305,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary), down 10,000 from a year earlier, and down 22,000 tons from end December 1960. During January beet processors' stocks increased by 98,000 tons; refiners' stocks decreased by 105,000 tons, importers of direct-consumption sugar stocks decreased by 13,000 tons, and mainland sugarcane processors' stocks by 1,800 tons.

3. Charges to quotas through January 31, 1961 were 536,000 short tons, raw value. In addition, 824,000 tons of non-quota purchase sugar were authorized for purchase of which about 313,000 tons were authorized for entry.

4. Regionally, calendar year 1960 total sugar deliveries as compared with 1959 were up 3.9 percent to the Southern region, and 1.6 percent to the Middle Atlantic region; to each the New England and North Central regions they were about the same in both years, but to the Western region they were down 4.3 percent.

Table 1.-Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, January-December 1960

(Short tons, raw value)

Item	Beet proc- essors	Importers	Main- land cane proc- essors	Refiners		Net total
				Raw	Refined	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SUPPLY						
1. Inventory Jan. 1, 1960						
a. 1959 quota	-	16,805	0	216,542	248,074	481,421
b. 1960 quota and other	1,223,359	22,544	19,026	189,980 <u>2/</u>	68,962 <u>2/</u>	1,523,871
c. Sub-total	1,223,359	39,349	19,026	406,522	317,036	2,005,292
2. Production and movement						
a. Received as direct- consumption sugar	0	639,382	0	0	5,937	645,319
b. Produced from beets or cane	2,440,371	0	523,104	51,940	60,375)	2,592,399 <u>3/</u>
Less deliveries to refiners	0	0	483,391	0	0)	
c. Receipts of raws by refiners	0	0	0	6,475,719	0)	- 12,458 <u>5/</u>
Less raws melted	0	0	0	6,488,177	0)	
d. Refined from raws melted	0	0	0	0	6,437,876	6,437,876
e. Adjustments	- 841	- 2,976	- 163	- 1,653	- 5,091	- 10,734
f. Sub-total	2,439,530	636,406	39,550	37,819	6,499,097	9,652,402
3. Net total supply	3,662,889	675,755	58,576	444,341	6,816,133	11,657,694
DISPOSITION						
4. Distribution for						
a. Quota purposes	2,164,748	571,080	40,274	3,624	6,480,470	9,260,196
b. Export	0	10,000	0	0	35,761	45,761
c. Livestock feed	323	22,910	0	0	1,142	24,375
d. Sub-total	2,165,071	603,990	40,274	3,624	6,517,373	9,330,332
5. Inventory Dec. 31, 1960						
a. 1960 Quota and non-quota	0	39,745	0	400,234	263,145	703,124
b. 1961 Quota and other	1,497,818	32,020	18,302	40,483 <u>6/</u>	35,615 <u>6/</u>	1,624,238
c. Sub-total	1,497,818	71,765	18,302	440,717	298,760	2,327,362
6. Total Distribution and Inventory	3,662,889	675,755	58,576	444,341	6,816,133	11,657,694

1/ Processor-refiners are included with refiners.

2/ Includes Mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quota: Raws, 14,546 tons; Refined, 26,110 tons; Total, 40,655 tons.

3/ Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.

4/ Includes 479,538 tons received from mainland cane processors.

5/ Receipts of raw sugar by refiners less melt.

6/ Includes mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quota: Raws, 22,824 tons; Refined, 33,658 tons; Total, 56,482 tons.

Table 2.-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors, January-December 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
<u>Continental United States</u>			
Refiners' raw	3,624	2,629	+ 995
Refiners' refined	6,517,373	6,314,730	+202,643
Beet processors' refined	2,165,071	2,242,435	- 77,364
Importers' direct consumption	603,990	667,964	- 63,974
Mainland sugarcane processors'	40,274	44,429	- 4,155
Total	9,330,332	9,272,187	+ 58,145
For: Export	45,761	57,431	- 11,670
Livestock feed	24,375	33,610	- 9,235
Continental consumption 1/	9,260,196	9,181,146	+ 79,050
<u>Puerto Rico</u>	110,289	110,677	- 388
<u>Hawaii</u>	44,072	39,911	+ 4,161

1/ Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3.-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, December 31, 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
<u>Refiners:</u>			
Raw 1/	440,717	406,522	+ 34,195
Refined 1/	298,760	317,036	- 18,276
Sub-total	739,477	723,558	+ 15,919
Beet processors, refined	1,497,818	1,223,359	+274,459
Importers, direct-consumption	71,765	39,349	+ 32,416
Mainland sugarcane processors 2/	18,302	19,026	- 724
Total	2,327,362	2,005,292	+322,070

1/ Includes mainland cane sugar not yet charged to quota: 1960 - Raws, 22,824; Refined, 33,658; Total, 56,482; 1959 - Raws, 14,545; Refined, 26,110; Total, 40,655.

2/ Establishments that acquire no raw sugar from others for refining. Processor-refiner stocks are included in refiners' stocks.

Table 4.-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, January 1961 and 1960

Item	1961 1/	1960
(Short tons, raw value)		
Refiners	447,706	428,569
Beet processors	448,435	80,986
Importers	22,334	37,527
Mainland sugarcane processors	1,500 2/	1,425
Total	619,975	548,507
Deliveries for:		
Export	N. A.	2,056
Livestock feed	N. A.	1,051
For continental consumption 3/	619,975	545,400

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated. 3/ Includes deliveries for U. S. military forces at home and abroad.

Table 5.-Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, February 4, 1961 and January 30, 1960

Item	1961 1/	1960	Change 1960 to 1961
(Short tons, raw value)			
Refiners' raw	320,963	314,227	+ 6,736
Refiners' refined	313,156	329,858	- 16,702
Sub-total	634,119	644,085	- 9,966
Beet processors' refined	1,595,515	1,378,089	+217,426
Importers' direct-consumption	59,014	35,826	+ 23,188
Mainland sugarcane processors	16,500 2/	24,360	- 7,860
Total	2,305,148	2,082,360	+222,788

1/ Preliminary.

2/ Estimated.

Table 6.-Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges January-December 1960 and 1959

Item	1960	1959	Change 1959 to 1960
(Short tons, raw value)			
<u>Production</u>			
Mainland cane	634,101	588,385	+ 45,716
Domestic beet	2,439,530	2,232,679	+206,851
Total	3,073,631	2,821,064	+252,567
<u>Quota charges</u>			
Mainland cane:			
Louisiana sugarcane processors			
For further processing	313,577	293,869	+ 19,708
For direct-consumption	31,786	35,159	- 3,373
Louisiana processor-refiners	95,334	103,371	- 8,037
Florida sugarcane processors	177,134	145,196	+ 31,938
Sub-total	617,831	577,595	+ 40,236
Beet processors	2,164,748	2,241,164	- 76,416
Total	2,782,579	2,818,759	- 36,180

Table 7.-Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply 1/ January-December 1960 and 1959

Source of Supply	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar	
	1960	1959	1960	1959
(Short tons, raw value)				
<u>Offshore</u>				
<u>Foreign</u>				
Cuba	1,942,352	2,908,722	327,932	412,713
Dominican Republic	432,550	109,462	16,212	17,576
Mexico	391,205	48,962	22,331	22,234
Peru	269,187	86,617	13,930	15,919
Philippines	1,093,745	964,987	39,735	37,120
Other countries	275,706	18,083	64,319	31,720
Sub-total	4,404,745	4,136,833	484,459	537,282
<u>Domestic</u>				
Hawaii	838,829	955,323	5,937 2/	21,518
Puerto Rico	741,444	818,889	154,923	139,086
Virgin Islands	6,954	12,301	0	0
Sub-total	1,587,227	1,786,513	160,860	160,604
Total offshore	5,991,972	5,923,346	645,319	697,886
Mainland cane area	531,478	480,467	60,375 3/	61,051
Acquired for reprocessing and samples	4,209	3,648	0	0
Grand total	6,527,659	6,407,461	705,694	758,937

1/ Includes quota exempt and over quota sugar as detailed in Table 8.

Table 8.-Receipts of quota exempt and over-quota sugar included in Table 7.

Purpose	Importers		Refiners		Total	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
	(Short tons, raw value)					
For feed	30,274	37,257	1,238	1,461	31,512	38,718
For re-export	10,004	19,878	40,186	41,028	50,190	60,906
For later release:						
Bonded	0	0	3,994	199,607	3,994	199,607
In customs custody	22,258	17,637	0	6,254	22,258	23,891
Total	62,536	74,772	45,418	248,350	107,954	323,122

2/ Refined sugar received by refiners.

3/ Refined sugar produced direct from cane by processor-refiner.

Table 9.-Status of 1961 Sugar Quotas as of February 10, 1961

		: Credit	: Charge to quota & offset			
		: for	: to drawback of duty 1/		Unfilled balance	
		: drawback	: Direct-		: Direct-	
		: of	: consump-		: consump-	
Area	Quota	: duty	: tion 2/		Total	: tion
<hr/> Short tons, raw value <hr/>						
Domestic Beet	544,443		202,000		342,443	
Mainland Cane	167,531		35,000		132,531	
Hawaii	303,853		80,980	0	222,873	8,554
Puerto Rico	317,716		49,882	9,858	267,834	27,218
Virgin Islands	4,332		0	0	4,332	
Republic of the Philippines	245,000	0	245,000	4,541	0	0
Cuba	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other foreign countries	92,826	0	67,971	12,227	24,855	4,566
Total Quotas	1,675,701	0	680,833	26,626	994,868	40,338
Subject to Section 408 (b) of Act	824,299	(For status see Table 11.)				
Total Requirements	2,500,000					
<u>Details of other foreign countries</u>						
Peru	30,377	0	29,858	2,719	519	5
Dominican Republic	27,789	0	26,579	1,553	1,210	876
Mexico	23,852	0	3,393	3,393	20,459	1,018
Nicaragua	4,368	0	3,385	1,873	983	983
Haiti	2,067	0	2,067	0	0	0
Netherlands	1,037	0	1,037	1,037	0	0 3/
China	995	0	686	686	309	309
Panama	995	0	632	632	363	363
Costa Rica	992	0	0	0	992	992
Canada	158	0	158	158	0	0 3/
United Kingdom	129	0	129	129	0	0 3/
Belgium	45	0	45	45	0	0 3/
British Guiana	21	0	1	1	20	20
Hong Kong	1	0	1	1	0	0 3/
Total	92,826	0	67,971 4/	12,227	24,855	4,566

LIQUID SUGAR 5/
Wine gallons of 72 per cent total sugar content

Cuba	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	207,721	5,796	201,928
British West Indies	75,000	0	75,000

- 1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated, (b) all other sugar entered or authorized for entry as of February 10, 1961.
- 2/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Philippines, 3,193; Total, 3,193.
- 3/ Sugar held in Custom's custody pending availability of quota: Belgium, 1,995; Canada, 4,433; Hong Kong, 51; Netherlands, 18,212; United Kingdom, 4,014.
- 4/ Under Sec. 212 (1) charges to quotas exclude the first 10 tons entered from Colombia, Germany, Ireland, South Africa, Poland and from each country listed.
- 5/ Under Sec. 212 (3) 180 gallons were entered from Australia, 201 from France, 60 from Italy, and 2,966 from the United Kingdom.

Table 10.-Quota-exempt sugar entered under Secs. 212 (4) and 211 (a) as of February 10, 1961

	For		
	:	:	:
Source	:	:	:
	Feed	Reexport	Total
	Short tons, raw value		
Brazil	0	608	608
Cuba	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	0	1,996	1,996
Mexico	65	328	393
Netherlands	590	0	590
Total	655	2,932	3,587

Table 11.-Status of non-quota purchase sugar as of February 10, 1961

Area	Authorized	Authorized for Entry for		Total
	for Purchase	Further Processing	Direct- Consumption	
Short tons, raw value				
Dominican Republic	222,723	99,496	0	123,227
Peru	215,000	84,835	0	130,165
Mexico	191,168	109,077	0	82,091
Philippines	122,683	122,683	0	0
Nicaragua	16,000	5,035	0	10,965
China (Formosa)	11,505	1,057	0	10,448
Brazil	11,474	0	0	11,474
British W. Indies and British Guiana	10,168	0	0	10,168
Columbia	6,000	0	0	6,000
Ecuador	6,000	0	0	6,000
El Salvador	2,000	0	0	2,000
Guatemala	2,000	0	0	2,000
Costa Rica	1,508	0	0	1,508
Panama	1,505	0	0	1,505
Netherlands	1,463	0	1,463	0
Canada	1,266	0	1,266	0
United Kingdom	1,034	0	1,033	1
Haiti	433	433	0	0
Belgium	361	0	361	0
Hong Kong	8	0	6	2
Total	824,299	422,616	4,129	397,554

Table 12.-Status of 1961 Sugar Quotas as of January 31, 1961

Area	Quota	Credit	Charge to quota & offset	Unfilled balance		
		for	to drawback of duty 1/		Direct	
		drawback	Direct			consump-
		of	consump-			
duty	Total	tion 2/	Total	tion		
Short tons, raw value						
Domestic Beet	544,443		149,000	395,443		
Mainland Cane	167,531		25,000	142,531		
Hawaii	303,853		64,615	239,238	8,554	
Puerto Rico	317,716		18,605	299,111	30,300	
Virgin Islands	4,332		0	4,332		
Republic of the						
Philippines	245,000	0	214,538	3,193	11,787	
Cuba	0	0	0	0	0	
Other foreign						
countries	92,826	0	63,761	29,065	8,543	
Total Quotas	1,675,701	0	535,519	20,022	59,184	

Subject to Section
408 (b) of Act 824,299 (For status see Table 14.)

Total Requirements 2,500,000

Details of other foreign countries

Peru	30,377	0	29,858	2,719	519	5
Dominican Republic	27,789	0	26,395	1,285	1,394	1,144
Mexico	23,852	0	3,672	3,672	20,180	739
Nicaragua	4,368	0	1,459	0	2,909	2,909
Heiti	2,067	0	0	0	2,067	1,750
Netherlands	1,037	0	1,037	1,037	0	0 3/
China	995	0	686	686	309	309
Panama	995	0	321	321	674	674
Costa Rica	992	0	0	0	992	992
Canada	158	0	158	158	0	0 3/
United Kingdom	129	0	129	129	0	0 3/
Belgium	45	0	45	45	0	0 3/
British Guiana	21	0	0	0	21	21
Hong Kong	1	0	1	1	0	0 3/
Total	92,826	0	63,761 4/	10,053	29,065	8,543

LIQUID SUGAR 5/ Wine gallons of 72 per cent total sugar content

Cuba	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	207,724	5,796	201,928
British West Indies	75,000	0	75,000

- 1/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated, (b) all other sugar entered or authorized for entry as of January 31, 1961.
 2/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Philippines 3,193; Total 3,193.
 3/ Sugar held in Customs custody pending availability of quota: Belgium, 1,995; Canada, 4,022; Hong Kong, 51; Netherlands, 18,212; United Kingdom, 4,014.
 4/ Under Sec. 212 (1) charges to quotas exclude the first 10 tons entered from Colombia, Germany, Ireland, South Africa and from each country listed.
 5/ Under Sec. 212 (3) 180 gallons were entered from Australia, 201 from France, 60 from Italy, and 2,000 from the United Kingdom.

Table 13.-Quota-exempt sugar entered under Secs. 212 (4) and 211 (a) as of January 31, 1961

Source	For		Total
	Feed	Reexport	
Short tons, raw value			
Brazil	0	608	608
Cuba	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	0	1,996	1,996
Mexico	63	234	297
Netherlands	590	0	590
Total	653	2,838	3,491

Table 14.-Status of non-quota purchase sugar as of January 31, 1961

Area	:	:	Authorized for Entry for		:	Total Unfilled Balance	
	:	Authorized	:	Further	Direct-		:
	:	for	:	Processing	Consumption		:
:	:	Purchase	:	:	:	:	
Short tons, raw value							
Dominican Republic		222,723		68,557	0	154,166	
Peru		215,000		61,155	0	153,845	
Mexico		191,168		84,135	0	107,033	
Philippines		122,683		90,150	0	32,533	
Nicaragua		16,000		5,044	0	10,956	
China (Formosa)		11,505		0	0	11,505	
Brazil		11,474		0	0	11,474	
British W. Indies and British Guiana		10,168		0	0	10,168	
Columbia		6,000		0	0	6,000	
Ecuador		6,000		0	0	6,000	
El Salvador		2,000		0	0	2,000	
Guatemala		2,000		0	0	2,000	
Costa Rica		1,508		0	0	1,508	
Panama		1,505		0	0	1,505	
Netherlands		1,463		0	1,463	0	
Canada		1,266		0	1,266	0	
United Kingdom		1,034		0	1,033	1	
Haiti		433		0	0	433	
Belgium		361		0	361	0	
Hong Kong		8		0	6	2	
Total		824,299		309,041	4,129	511,129	

Table 15- Primary distribution of sugar, Continental United States by States, December 1960

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	105,031		2,373	200	107,604
Maine	55,481				55,481
Massachusetts	428,471		4,335	220	433,026
New Hampshire	26,352				26,352
Rhode Island	41,629		3,300		44,929
Vermont	27,347				27,347
Sub-total	685,311		10,008	420	695,739
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	560,162		51,946		612,108
New York	1,397,904	53,026	70,340		1,521,270
Pennsylvania	758,864	40,576	106,884	8	906,332
Sub-total	2,716,930	93,602	229,170	8	3,039,710
North Central					
Illinois	572,174	797,029	2,020	80,415	1,451,638
Indiana	243,982	77,614	1,717	1,255	324,568
Iowa	48,912	118,563			167,475
Kansas	36,726	78,937			115,663
Michigan	216,951	263,271	432	1	480,655
Minnesota	47,734	183,745	320	1,000	232,799
Missouri	216,176	109,427		3,002	328,605
Nebraska	18,669	101,184		600	120,453
North Dakota	686	23,149			23,835
Ohio	539,971	161,164	658	1,000	702,793
South Dakota	4,781	39,039			43,820
Wisconsin	107,992	160,163	3,265	59,000	330,420
Sub-total	2,054,754	2,113,285	8,412	146,273	4,322,724
Southern					
Alabama	214,056			15,920	229,976
Arkansas	75,921	3,000		1	78,922
Delaware	20,407		160		20,567
District of Columbia	34,990		3,894		38,884
Florida	184,688		77,519	10,834	273,041
Georgia	365,179		12,255	2,820	380,254
Kentucky	173,512	810		3,143	177,465
Louisiana	265,602			17,223	282,825
Maryland	290,708		30,329		321,037
Mississippi	131,775			1,515	133,290
North Carolina	230,563		27,859	600	259,022
Oklahoma	103,578	22,839			126,417
South Carolina	129,358		3,655		133,013
Tennessee	251,861			12,001	263,862
Texas	386,539	156,871	2,345	68,157	613,912
Virginia	183,914	19,000	31,845		234,759
West Virginia	86,924	1,950	1,162		90,036
Sub-total	3,129,575	204,470	191,023	132,214	3,657,282
Western					
Alaska	2,864	1,394			4,258
Arizona	29,031	21,887			50,918
California	448,267	783,996	18,400	1,200	1,251,863
Colorado	6,856	80,804		720	88,380
Idaho	2,327	19,302			21,629
Montana	2,669	25,926			28,595
Nevada	5,738	4,911			10,649
New Mexico	8,630	13,813			22,443
Oregon	42,804	52,921	1,600		97,325
Utah	4,233	40,072		140	44,445
Washington	52,934	109,427			162,361
Wyoming		8,646			8,646
Sub-total	606,353	1,163,099	20,000	2,060	1,791,512
Grand total	9,192,923	3,574,456	458,613	280,975	13,506,967

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 16.- Primary distribution of sugar, Continental United States by States, Fourth Quarter 1960

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	309,110		11,800	440	321,350
Maine	158,925		580		159,505
Massachusetts	1,270,498		18,410	220	1,289,128
New Hampshire	73,682		220		73,902
Rhode Island	126,573		4,980		131,556
Vermont	70,493		17,000		87,493
Sub-total	2,009,284		52,990	660	2,052,934
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	1,792,433		165,081		1,957,514
New York	3,993,454	105,798	270,856		4,370,108
Pennsylvania	2,432,135	89,276	406,178	18	2,927,507
Sub-total	8,218,022	195,074	842,115	18	9,255,229
North Central					
Illinois	1,970,418	2,176,454	13,786	121,133	4,281,791
Indiana	733,424	260,530	8,896	2,269	1,005,119
Iowa	138,059	280,230	355		418,644
Kansas	104,264	203,183		6	307,453
Michigan	635,293	698,325	9,460	7	1,343,085
Minnesota	106,796	424,476	665	1,000	532,937
Missouri	612,119	330,731	736	5,002	948,588
Nebraska	61,774	237,746		610	300,130
North Dakota	2,114	61,848			63,962
Ohio	1,670,196	381,690	17,664	3,100	2,072,650
South Dakota	9,257	101,707			110,964
Wisconsin	305,988	477,030	9,085	59,000	851,103
Sub-total	6,349,702	5,633,950	60,647	192,127	12,236,426
Southern					
Alabama	634,960			18,001	652,961
Arkansas	241,695	7,000		1	248,696
Delaware	59,433		2,050	1	61,484
District of Columbia	104,267		14,552		118,819
Florida	477,120		242,880	16,309	736,309
Georgia	1,049,577		35,570	5,320	1,090,567
Kentucky	509,652	2,849	2,328	4,148	518,977
Louisiana	860,568			24,171	884,739
Maryland	845,764		113,818		959,582
Mississippi	431,511			4,445	435,956
North Carolina	717,261		113,510	600	831,371
Oklahoma	286,687	63,129			349,816
South Carolina	384,525		17,924		402,449
Tennessee	766,649		320	22,658	789,627
Texas	1,440,947	361,222	9,655	70,145	1,881,969
Virginia	574,920	25,000	164,339	10	764,269
West Virginia	239,002	3,550	5,305		248,857
Sub-total	9,624,638	462,750	723,351	165,809	10,976,548
Western					
Alaska	6,580	4,668			11,248
Arizona	88,998	52,226			141,224
California	1,384,739	1,921,954	62,600	1,202	3,370,495
Colorado	17,615	218,209		720	236,544
Idaho	7,882	53,005			60,887
Montana	5,905	69,469			75,374
Nevada	13,671	10,102			23,773
New Mexico	26,499	42,892			69,391
Oregon	124,645	156,347	11,825		292,817
Utah	15,745	114,152		140	130,048
Washington	160,687	339,182	4,000		503,869
Wyoming	1,252	22,831			24,083
Sub-total	1,854,219	3,005,047	78,425	2,032	4,939,753
Grand total	28,055,865	9,296,821	1,757,528	360,676	39,470,890

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 17- Primary Distribution of sugar, Continental United States by States, January-December 1960

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	1,297,296		59,518	1,580	1,358,394
Maine	702,537		7,610		710,147
Massachusetts	5,076,149		103,873	1,720	5,181,742
New Hampshire	356,035		1,120		357,155
Rhode Island	518,192		29,400		547,592
Vermont	243,216		83,001		326,217
Sub-total	8,193,425		284,522	3,300	8,481,247
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	7,463,162		715,305	2,001	8,180,468
New York	15,607,344	223,778	1,582,488		17,413,610
Pennsylvania	10,215,456	206,687	2,071,779	46	12,493,968
Sub-total	33,285,962	430,465	4,359,572	2,047	38,088,046
North Central					
Illinois	8,049,634	8,536,989	59,291	285,483	16,931,397
Indiana	3,321,434	1,093,909	34,571	2,292	4,452,206
Iowa	593,384	1,508,897	7,083		2,109,364
Kansas	487,240	972,534		9	1,459,783
Michigan	3,127,031	2,749,384	181,614	1,007	6,059,036
Minnesota	422,751	2,061,012	2,326	1,000	2,487,089
Missouri	2,911,926	1,389,461	736	8,611	4,310,734
Nebraska	257,721	1,237,546		621	1,495,888
North Dakota	9,045	321,848			330,893
Ohio	7,746,350	1,223,937	109,707	8,906	9,088,900
South Dakota	32,556	474,796			507,352
Wisconsin	1,378,565	1,978,824	62,909	59,000	3,479,298
Sub-total	28,337,637	23,549,137	456,237	366,929	52,711,940
Southern					
Alabama	2,982,680			22,411	3,005,091
Arkansas	1,163,103	37,337		1	1,200,441
Delaware	234,436		13,510	2	247,948
District of Columbia	470,513		61,560		532,073
Florida	1,710,388	1	1,874,274	120,395	3,705,058
Georgia	4,955,424		426,876	25,563	5,407,863
Kentucky	2,421,251	10,389	88,244	10,202	2,530,086
Louisiana	3,665,814		1,188	49,691	3,716,693
Maryland	3,711,659	1	400,249		4,111,909
Mississippi	2,006,908			14,790	2,021,698
North Carolina	3,276,448		888,553	600	4,165,601
Oklahoma	1,272,981	288,435	2,827		1,564,243
South Carolina	1,739,815		117,079		1,856,894
Tennessee	3,522,037		34,220	57,384	3,623,641
Texas	6,799,105	1,352,887	84,368	79,032	8,325,392
Virginia	2,296,388	25,000	963,426	17	3,284,831
West Virginia	962,637	5,150	51,805		1,019,592
Sub-total	43,191,587	1,729,200	5,008,179	390,088	50,319,054
Western					
Alaska	30,412	17,453			47,865
Arizona	368,651	210,502			579,153
California	6,842,667	9,295,710	280,238	2,402	16,422,017
Colorado	82,476	1,024,656		1,404	1,108,536
Idaho	43,498	326,948			370,446
Montana	22,773	332,232		3	355,008
Nevada	67,813	42,028			109,841
New Mexico	130,753	192,817			323,570
Oregon	595,424	973,345	134,264		1,703,033
Utah	59,042	637,781		140	696,963
Washington	717,243	1,615,903	132,259		2,465,405
Wyoming	7,251	105,845			113,096
Sub-total	8,966,003	14,776,220	546,761	3,949	24,294,933
Grand total	121,976,614	40,485,022	10,667,271	766,313	173,895,220

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 18- Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by states, calendar years 1960 and 1959

State and region	Cane sugar refiners		Beet processors		Total all Primary Distributors ^{2/}	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
Thousands of hundredweights ^{1/}						
New England						
Connecticut	1,297	1,275			1,358	1,341
Maine	703	680			710	697
Massachusetts	5,076	5,079		*	5,182	5,215
New Hampshire	356	359			357	359
Rhode Island	518	512			548	542
Vermont	243	243			326	318
Sub-total	8,193	8,148		*	8,481	8,472
Mid-Atlantic						
New Jersey	7,463	7,463		*	8,180	8,166
New York	15,607	15,374	224	261	17,414	17,121
Pennsylvania	10,216	9,312	207	162	12,494	12,203
Sub-total	33,286	32,149	431	423	38,088	37,490
North Central						
Illinois	8,050	7,876	8,537	9,083	16,932	17,309
Indiana	3,322	3,153	1,094	896	4,452	4,072
Iowa	593	579	1,509	1,574	2,109	2,169
Kansas	487	563	973	891	1,460	1,561
Michigan	3,127	2,972	2,749	3,044	6,059	6,309
Minnesota	423	473	2,061	1,957	2,487	2,430
Missouri	2,912	2,827	1,389	1,254	4,311	4,123
Nebraska	258	292	1,237	1,160	1,496	1,470
North Dakota	9	10	322	391	331	405
Ohio	7,746	7,250	1,224	1,375	9,089	8,770
South Dakota	32	28	475	434	507	462
Wisconsin	1,379	1,338	1,979	2,069	3,479	3,503
Sub-total	28,338	27,461	23,549	24,128	52,712	52,583
Southern						
Alabama	2,983	3,019			3,005	3,050
Arkansas	1,163	1,052	37	59	1,200	1,111
Delaware	234	208			248	223
District of Columbia	471	511			532	579
Florida	1,710	1,495	*		3,705	3,564
Georgia	4,955	4,626			5,408	5,182
Kentucky	2,421	2,156	10	12	2,530	2,225
Louisiana	3,666	3,696			3,717	3,777
Maryland	3,712	3,469	*		4,112	3,956
Mississippi	2,007	2,045			2,022	2,055
North Carolina	3,277	3,194			4,166	3,985
Oklahoma	1,273	1,214	289	268	1,564	1,482
South Carolina	1,740	1,746			1,857	1,876
Tennessee	3,522	3,224			3,624	3,306
Texas	6,799	6,568	1,363	1,305	8,325	8,047
Virginia	2,295	2,135	25	10	3,285	3,002
West Virginia	963	959	5	3	1,019	1,011
Sub-total	43,192	41,318	1,729	1,557	50,319	48,431
Western						
Alaska	30	40	18	26	48	66
Arizona	369	355	210	214	579	572
California	6,843	6,925	9,297	9,974	16,422	17,293
Colorado	82	75	1,024	1,020	1,109	1,096
Idaho	43	42	327	326	370	368
Montana	23	21	332	343	355	364
Nevada	68	71	42	44	110	115
New Mexico	131	134	193	223	324	357
Oregon	596	653	973	1,105	1,703	1,868
Utah	59	60	638	642	697	703
Washington	717	674	1,616	1,712	2,465	2,473
Wyoming	7	7	106	116	113	123
Sub-total	8,968	9,057	14,776	15,745	24,295	25,398
Grand total	121,977	118,133	40,485	41,953	173,895	172,374

^{1/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

^{2/} Includes deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar and mainland cane sugar mills.

* Less than 500 bags.

Table 19.-Sugar prices

Year and Month	:Raw cane sugar-spot prices :			Quota 3/ :	Refined Beet Sugar - Quoted		
	:Domestic :			Premiums :	Wholesale (Gross) 4/		
	:Sugar at N.Y.:	"World"		and :		Chicago	Pacific
	:Duty Paid 1/:	Sugar 2/:		Discounts :	Eastern	West	Coast
Cents per pound							
1956-60 Monthly Average	6.23	3.65		+1.65	8.65	8.62	8.97
1959 Monthly Average	6.24	2.97		+2.38	8.71	8.67	9.10
1960 Monthly Average	6.30	3.14		+2.21	8.79	8.77	8.96
1960							
February	6.00	3.02		+2.04	8.60	8.60	8.90
March	6.11	3.05		+2.09	8.60	8.60	8.90
April	6.17	3.04		+2.16	8.60	8.60	8.90
May	6.09	3.05		+2.09	8.60	8.60	8.90
June	6.25	2.97		+2.34	8.60	8.60	8.90
July	6.48	3.26		+2.28	8.98	8.91	8.94
August	6.47	3.31		+2.22	9.35	9.15	9.15
September	6.59	3.25		+2.40	9.16	8.95	9.15
October	6.52	3.25		+2.33	9.05	8.95	8.95
November	6.53	3.25		+2.34	8.75	8.89	8.95
December	6.46	3.25		+2.27	8.59	8.80	8.95
1961							
January	6.39	3.03		+2.44	8.44	8.74	8.95
Last 12-Month Average	6.34	3.14		+2.25	8.78	8.78	8.96
Year and Month	: Refined Cane Sugar - Quoted Wholesale (Gross) 4/						: Refined
	: New : South : : Chicago : Pacific :						: Retail
	: York :	East :		Gulf :	West :	Coast :	: U. S.
							: Average
Cents per pound							
1956-60 Monthly Average	9.19	9.07		9.06	8.83	9.03	11.18
1959 Monthly Average	9.33	9.19		9.28	8.88	9.10	11.43
1960 Monthly Average	9.43	9.40		9.39	8.97	8.96	11.63
1960							
February	9.35	9.20		9.30	8.80	8.90	11.46
March	9.23	9.25		9.30	8.80	8.90	11.50
April	9.20	9.30		9.30	8.80	8.90	11.48
May	9.20	9.30		9.30	8.80	8.90	11.46
June	9.20	9.30		9.30	8.80	8.90	11.44
July	9.47	9.42		9.40	9.11	8.94	11.48
August	9.70	9.60		9.50	9.35	9.15	11.72
September	9.70	9.60		9.50	9.15	9.15	11.84
October	9.70	9.60		9.50	9.15	8.95	11.88
November	9.70	9.60		9.50	9.09	8.95	11.88
December	9.40	9.45		9.50	9.00	8.95	11.88
1961							
January	9.55	9.45		9.50	8.89	8.95	
Last 12-Month Average	9.45	9.42		9.41	8.98	8.96	11.64 5/

- 1/ Spot prices during 1956-60 were for sugar in bags under Contract #6 plus .50 cent per pound duty (Cuban). Beginning with 1961 spot prices are for bulk sugar under Contract #7, the terms of which are duty paid or duty free.
- 2/ Spot prices during 1956-60 based on #4 Contract which was for bagged sugar F.A.S. Cuba. Beginning with 1961 spot prices are those under #8 Contract which is also for bagged sugar but F.O.B. and stowed at greater Caribbean ports (including Brazil).
- 3/ For 1956-1960 these amounts are the difference between the spot prices of the #6 "Domestic" Contract rolled back to Cuba (minus freight and insurance) and the spot prices of the #4 "World" Contract. Beginning with 1961 the #7 "Domestic Bulk" Contract has been adjusted by deducting duty (.625¢), computed freight, insurance and unloading charges, and adding the bag allowance (currently .04¢) before calculating the differential from #8 "World" Contract spot prices.
- 4/ These are basis prices in 100 pound paper bags, NOT delivered prices. To obtain delivered prices add "Freight Prepay" and deduct discounts and allowances. For illustration see Sugar Reports 81, January 1959, pages 5 to 9.
- 5/ 11-month Average.

Table 20. - Refined sugar production and month-end stocks.

Year and Month	Production		Month-end Stocks 1/	
	Cane sugar	Beet	Cane sugar	Beet
	refiners	processors	refiners	processors
1,000 short tons, raw value				
1956-60 monthly average	524	182	295	838
1959 monthly average	529	186	317	823
1960 monthly average	542	203	312	915
<u>1960</u>				
February	463	51	336	1,317
March	573	24	363	1,174
April	495	47	370	1,064
May	542	47	373	918
June	639	45	325	747
July	626	30	246	483
August	635	62	281	311
September	573	128	282	225
October	495	618	259	699
November	508	625	278	1,163
December	510	526	299	1,498
<u>1961</u>				
January 2/	460	245	313	1,596
Last 12-month Average	543	204	310	933

1/ Includes over-quota and quota exempt sugar. 2/ Preliminary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Commodity Stabilization Service
Sugar Division
Washington 25, D. C.

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID

OFFICIAL BUSINESS